

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 28, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicants appreciate the indication by the Examiner that claims 4-19 and 25-27 recite allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-3 and 20-24, 28, and 29 are rejected and claims 4-19 and 25-27 are objected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 5, 7, 18-22, 28 and 29 have been amended and claims 3 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 30 has been added. Claims 1-23 and 25-29 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 20-22, 24, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,597,349 to Koyama et al. (hereinafter "Koyama"). Claims 2 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama. The Examiner objects to claims 4-19 and 25-27.

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 20-22, 24, 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Koyama is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 20, 28, and 29 as amended each recite the subject matter previously recited in claim 4 and which was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 20, 28, and 29 are not anticipated by Koyama and are allowable.

Applicants submit that the rejection to claim 3 is moot as claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 21 recites a driving method of a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including "wherein, the same data is supplied to any one of the data lines during first and third ones of the  $\frac{1}{4}$  periods of the horizontal period." Claim 22 recites a driving method of a liquid crystal display having a combination of features including "wherein the same data is supplied to any one of the data lines during second and fourth ones of the  $\frac{1}{4}$  periods of the horizontal period." Applicants submit that Koyama does not disclose the identified combinations of features recited in claims 21 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 21 and 22 are not anticipated by Koyama.

Claim 24 depends from claim 20 and includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 20. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is not anticipated by Koyama and is allowable at least based on its dependency from claim 20 and for the reasons given above for claim 20.

The rejection of claims 2 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that Koyama does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims.

With respect to claim 2, Applicants note that claim 2 depends from claim 1 and includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above claim 1 is not anticipated by Koyama and includes subject matter identified by the Examiner as being allowable. The Examiner's remarks in the Office Action in rejecting claim 2 cite no teaching curing the deficiencies identified in Koyama with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 2 is allowable over Koyama.

With respect to claim 23, Applicants note that claim 23 depends from claim 20 and includes all of the limitations of claim 20. As discussed above claim 20 is not anticipated by Koyama and includes subject matter identified by the Examiner as being allowable. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 23 is allowable over Koyama.

The Examiner objects to claims 4-19 and 25-27 as depending from a rejected base claim. Claim 4 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 5-17 each depends from claim 1 and Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable for the reasons given above, and that claims 5-17 each depends from an allowable base claim. Claims 18 and 19 have been rewritten into independent format reciting all of the limitations of their respective base claims and any intervening claims as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 4-19 be withdrawn.

Claims 25-27 each depend from claim 20. Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable at least for the reasons given above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 25-27 each depend from an allowable base claim and respectfully request that objection to claims 25-27 be withdrawn.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37

C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 28, 2006

By

  
Rebecca G. Rudich  
Registration No. 41,786

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicants